

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed with an RCE so that further change to the claims may be considered by the Examiner that hopefully will place the application into condition for allowance and forego the need for proceeding with filing of a Brief on Appeal. By this Amendment, independent claims 25 and 52 have once again been amended in an effort to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art references of record. Applicant believes that the amendments to the two independent claims will eliminate any possible interpretation of the previous claim language that would allow them to read on the prior art references of record.

It is clear from a reading of the subject specification and the two references relied upon in the rejection of claims 25 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 102, US Patent No. 5,500,897 to Hartman, Jr. and US Patent No. 6484260 to Scott et al., that the subject invention differs substantially from the inventions disclosed in these references. Applicant therefore assumes that the previous language of the claims may have been causing some confusion which led the panel review Examiners to conclude that the references arguably anticipate claims 25 and 52.

A detailed discussion of the present invention and how it differs from the cited references has already been provided in the previously filed papers and need not be repeated in detail here. However, the changes to the claims that Applicant respectfully submits clearly distinguish the claims over Hartmann and Scott will be discussed. As has been noted previously, the present invention overcomes the drawbacks of prior art systems that require synchronization of various transceiver clocks in a secure communications system via simultaneous resetting of all the clocks so that the clock values can be compared later to verify authenticity of transmissions between the system transceivers. The present invention overcomes the need for resetting the clocks by instead determining the difference between encoder and decoder clock values during an initial learning

process and then storing this difference value at the decoder. When a transmission is later received from the encoder, the transmitted encoder clock value is not compared to the decoder clock value as in the prior art. Instead, the mathematical difference between the presently received encoder clock value and the decoder clock value at the time of receipt of the transmission is calculated through subtraction. This difference value is then compared to the previously stored difference value to verify that the transmission came from the same encoder that previously sent its clock value to the decoder during the learning process.

To emphasize the foregoing key distinguishing feature, claims 25 and 52 have been amended to specify the formation of the difference value and the comparisons of this difference value to a later formed difference value. In addition, both claims have been amended to specify that the clocks of the encoder and decoder are unsynchronized with one another. Applicant respectfully submits that these changes clearly distinguish claims 25 and 52 over Hartmann and Scott, respectively, and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are therefore overcome, as are the various rejections of the numerous dependent claims which add other features, many of which are also not disclosed or suggested in the prior art.

In support of this argument, Applicant notes that no mention is made at all of the formation of a mathematical difference value in Scott. Hartmann does mention formation of a difference value but only to measure clock drift in a synchronized system. In the Hartmann system, a clock value is initially stored and the difference between this value and a value later received from the same clock is formed to measure clock drift. This is completely different from the subject invention in which the difference between two different unsynchronized clocks is determined and stored.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits therefore that the changes to claims 25 and 52 clearly distinguish the claimed invention over those disclosed in Hartmann, Scott and the other references of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /WAB/
William A. Blake
Reg. No. 30,548

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
P.O. Box 2266, Eads Station
Arlington, VA. 22202
(703) 415-1500
Dated: July 28, 2006